REMARKS

Claim 1 calls for controlling management of data storage by said client based on information included in a message from a server. One example of controlling management of data storage is set forth in claim 10. There, it is explained that an identifier may indicate a change to a partition on said storage device.

The phrase "controlling management of data storage" must mean something different than "controlling data storage." The management of data storage relates to the way data storage is handled on the client. This is clearly distinct from simply storing data on the client. All that is described in Pothapragada is storing data on the recipient of a request. (However, it should be noted that the citation to columns 35-45 in the rejection of claim 1 is not understood since there are no columns in this range).

One example of the way management of data may be controlled is to control the partitions as set forth in independent claim 10. Dependent claim 10 was also rejected on Pothapragada, but there is nothing in Pothapragada about controlling partitions on the client. This is because there is no controlling the management of data storage on the client.

Even if Pothapragada disclosed a method in which the client can be told to provide information about where a server could store data on the client, such an operation is not commensurate with the claim language of "controlling management of data storage." There is no management of data storage that is provided. Instead, all that is done is to provide an identifier to indicate a location. But there is no control of the management based on information included in the message.

In the cited material in column 2 of the Pothapragada reference, it is indicated that the request specifies one or more criteria associated with the requested storage space. But this is simply a specification of the space that is needed. There is no information that could be used to change the management of the data storage.

New dependent claim 31 is more specific than controlling management of data storage. It calls for controlling the organization of data storage. Clearly, no such thing is provided in the cited reference.

In view of these remarks, the application should now be in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 2, 2005

Timothy M. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994 TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C. 8554 Katy Freeway, Suite 100

Houston, TX 77024 713/468-8880 [Phone] 713/468-8883 [Fax]

Attorneys for Intel Corporation